

### **Remarks**

In response to the final Office Action dated August 7, 2006, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 10, 19, 31, 36, 37, 40, and 41 have been amended. The claims have been amended to clarify that data is determined to be in a valid format when a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates. Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs 0026-0028 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris (U.S. 5,813,017) in view of Adamchick (U.S. 5,761,668). Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Official Notice.

### **Applicant's Statement of the Substance of the Interview**

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicant and the Examiner was held on December 7, 2006 to discuss a proposed amendment to address the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). In the interview, the Examiner agreed that a proposed amendment clarifying that data is determined to be in a valid format when a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates appeared to distinguish the cited references of record.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28, 31-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Adamchick. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a client-server computer system which includes a client application server that utilizes data in a particular form and generates a validation request for validation of the data and wherein the request includes the data in an initial form; an application server accessible by a plurality of client application servers via a plurality of application software protocols, wherein said application server provides a data validation service on the data received from the client application server in response to receiving the validation request from the client application server, wherein the data validation service compares the data in the initial form to a reference for the particular form utilized by the client application to determine whether the initial form matches the particular form and returns to the same client application server that generated the validation request an indication of valid or invalid, wherein the data is determined to be in a valid format when a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates; and a storage mass coupled to said application server for storing a system of dynamically maintainable validation functions for performing said validation service.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Morris and Adamchick fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1.

For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose that the data utilized by the client application server is determined to be in a valid format (via a validation request), when a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates.

Morris discusses a system that compares a managed file at a client with an original backup file stored on an application server whereby only the changed portion of the file (i.e., a delta) is stored at the application server (see Abstract, Figs. 2-4; col. 6, lines 35-39; col. 6, lines 50-67). Morris however, fails to disclose determining the validity of data based on whether a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates, as recited in amended claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Morris discusses a validation service which compares data in an initial form to a reference for a particular form utilized by a client application to determine a match, however, Morris only discusses validity in terms of unmodified files which are returned and modified files which are further inquired about and thus fails to discuss determining the validity of data as recited in amended claim 1.

Adamchick, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Morris, discusses converting computer software and databases for the year 2000 problem (i.e., the Y2K problem) which includes extending the data used by the internal clock of a computer from 1999 to the year 2000 by converting every data in a computer database to a “Millennium” format using a Julian date (see abstract; col. 4, lines 39-63). As discussed in Applicant’s previous response, it is respectfully submitted that

Adamchick is nonanalogous art in that the reference is not concerned with a client validating information supplied by a central server. Furthermore, Adamchick fails to disclose checking whether a date specified in data is in a valid format based on whether a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates, as recited in amended claim 1. Adamchick merely discusses a conversion device that converts the form of all dates in a computer based on an algorithm.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Morris and Adamchick fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 4, 6, and 8 depend from amended independent claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 10, 19, 31, 36, 37, 40, and 41 all recite similar features as amended independent claim 1 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 11, 13, 15, 17, 22, 24-26, 28, 32, 34, and 38 depend from amended independent claims 10, 19, 31, and 37, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are rejected as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Official Notice. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 depend from amended independent claims 1, 10, 19, 31, and 37 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, Morris fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in the aforementioned claims. Therefore, claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39 are allowable over Morris for at least the same reasons. In the Office Action, Official Notice is relied upon for allegedly teaching the use of an LDAP system which is a standardized networking protocol designed for querying and modifying directory services. However, the Official Notice rejection fails to address the additional novel features specified in the claims with respect to determining the validity of data based on whether a date item specified in the data has a non-empty table field, a date specified in the data is in a valid date format, and when the date falls within a set of range of dates. Since the combination of Morris and Official Notice fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20-21, 23, 27, 29-30, 35, and 39, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

The present Amendment is being filed with a request and fee for a two-month extension of time. No additional fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Date: January 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Alton Hornsby III/

Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(678) 565-4748